UNITED
NATIONS

DP

Governing Council
of the
United Nations
Development Programme

Distr.
LIMITED

DP/1991/SCPM/L.7/Add.1
17 September 1991

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME
MATTERS
Resumed thirty-eighth session
16-18 September 1991, New York

DRAFT REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS ON ITS IN-SESSIONAL MEETING HELD DURING THE RESUMED THIRTY-EIGHTH SESSION OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

Addendum

Summary of the discussion in the Committee

1. Twenty-three delegations made statements during the first meeting, giving their views on the Special Programme Resources (SPR) proposals, which can be summarized as follows.

2. With regard to the presentation of the programming document, some delegations remarked that the programme proposals varied greatly in quality and scope, and that they did not all follow the guidelines agreed upon at the special session of the Governing Council in February 1991. The need for a general introduction was stressed, together with a brief summary of the objectives and criteria of the SPR. Particular concern was expressed over the need to improve the assessments of prior experience for each programme during the fourth cycle and to draw lessons of experience for the fifth cycle.

3. Many delegations discussed the role of the SPR, stressing that they should be of a catalytic nature and could be used as seed money to carry out innovative and experimental initiatives, which should then be followed up through other sorces of funding. They should facilitate resource mobilization and be complementary to the country, regional and interregional indicative planning figures (IPFs). Clearer focus was thus required to ensure that specific and realistic objectives were chosen for the limited resources available, so that once achieved, SPR resources can be reoriented to other purposes. The great value of the SPR as a coordinating tool for UNDP and governments was also emphasized.

4. Some delegations raised the question of the modalities and procedures for SPR use, stressing the need to use national resources, expertise and institutions as much as possible. At the same time, emphasis was placed on the need to use the expertise of United Nations specialized agencies as appropriate while the responsible UNDP departments should provide technical and substantive support. The role of the Bureau for Programme and Policy Evaluation (BPPE) should lie in the coordination, monitoring and evaluation of the use of the SPR. Mention was also made of the need to draw up clear criteria and procedures for the formulation and implementation of projects under the SPR.

5. Many delegations stressed the need for close monitoring and evaluation, so that the necessary lessons of experience are drawn, for the follow-up activities mentioned above. Suitable performance indicators should be devised. A mid-term evaluation was recommended in two or three years for each of the programmes, and for the use of the SPR as a whole.

6. The need for the eventual reallocation of resources was recognized, particularly in the light of the recommendations of the mid-term review proposed above. The possibility of transferring certain regionally focused programmes (for instance those relating to the Special Plan of Economic Cooperation for Central America (C2) and to the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development 1986-1990 (C3)) to the respective regional IPFs was raised by one delegation.

7. The Standing Committee for Programme Matters then reviewed each of the programmes in turn.